SCIENCE & GOVERNMENT REPORT

10th Year of Publication

The Independent Bulletin of Science Policy

Vol. X, No. 11 | P.O. Box 6226A, Washington, D.C. 20015 | June 15, 1980

Academy on Griddle for Fat's-Okay Report

"Toward Healthful Diets," the National Academy of Science's fat's-okay contribution to nutritional confusion, has turned into a public-relations disaster for the venerable institution that bills itself as the trustworthy high court of science.

The report, produced by the Academy's Food and Nutrition Board, was quickly tagged by the *Washington Post* as the product of a committee dominated by two long-time consultant biochemists to the food industry, Alfred E. Harper, University of Wisconsin, who chairs the Board, and Robert E. Olson, St. Louis University, who drafted the report. Olson, who consults for the egg industry, has long pooh-poohed the health hazards of cholesterol. When the report was issued, May 27, the Academy incorrectly suggested — and later put out a correction — that the National Institutes of Health had

NSF Gets a Turndown For Director's Post—Page 5

ordered the underlying study; the Academy did not reveal that Harper and Olson, as well as several others on the 15-member board, are associated with the food industry. To the contrary, the Academy sought to convey the impression that the report was the product of an inquiry that took into consideration various scientifically supportable views on the relationship between disease and diet. Thus, the flyleaf of the report contains the Academy's usual vow of purity: "The members of the Committee responsible for the report were chosen for their special competencies and with regard for appropriate balance."

Academy officials later acknowledged, however, that the committee did not include any members known to oppose the Harper-Olson thesis on the role of saturated fats and cholesterol in cardiovascular disease.

The Academy's performance on this study has evoked some of the nastiest editorial comments ever directed at the 117-year-old institution. Thus, the *Washington Post* stated in an editorial that the report has "soiled the reputation of the board and of the academy for rendering careful scientific advice." And the *New York Times* editorially described the report as "so one-sided that it makes a dubious guide to national nutrition policies." The *Times* editorial noted that the board's position is considered scientifically respectable in some quarters and merits attention, but it went on to observe that "the report was prepared by . . . a 15-member group whose objectivity and aptitude are in doubt. The board lacks an epidemiologist or cardiologist, so its dismissal of epidemiological evidence linking diet and heart disease is suspect . . . The board and some of its members have been funded by food companies whose sales might suffer from large-scale changes in eating habits, so the appearances are not right."

Though the Academy remains tightlipped about the genesis of this increasingly embarrassing report, SGR has learned that Academy President Philip Handler responded with an "enthusiastic" memo, as one staffer described it, after reading a draft of the report.

Handler has for several years been sniping at scientists who assist consumer-oriented public interest groups, and, in pontifical fashion, has raised questions about their motives and professional qualifications. The most recent episode came in April in his address to the annual meeting of the Academy, wherein he stated that scientists must "take issue with those who have traded on public fears to put in place the nay-saying philosophy

(Continued on Page 2)

In Brief

Out and Up: Edward R. Jayne II is quitting the Office of Management and Budget, where he's Associate Director for National Security and International Affairs, to join General Dynamics as an aerospace executive. Meanwhile former HEW chief Joe Califano, back in private law practice in Washington, has signed on as a lobbyist for Quality Care, a national home health-care chain that's trying to get its services covered by Medicare, which is handled by Califano's old department.

House of Fear: A June 10 New York Times *profile of the National Academy of Sciences says staffers there describe NAS President Philip Handler "as a difficult man of autocratic style," and that "of the academy's 1100-strong staff, almost none . . . would agree to talk without assurance of confidentiality. . ."*

Oldtimers on the Washington scene are marveling at the National Science Foundation's fast-moving response to the research opportunities presented by Mt. St. Helens' big eruption on May 18. By May 30, NSF had notified research institutions throughout the country that special funds and quick processing of applications would be made available for "data gathering or experiments on transient phenomena" at the site.

Congress Shunning Carter Cuts for Research

Tight fisted as they may talk, lawmakers on Capitol Hill are showing reluctance to follow President Carter in holding down spending for scientific research in the coming fiscal year.

In his first budget message this year, the one he delivered in January, the President proposed raising spending for basic research by about 13 per cent — just enough to keep ahead of expected inflation and to allow for some real growth in most federally supported research programs. By the time the revised "anti-inflation" budget was released this spring, much of the earlier increases had been eaten away by the ever- growing costs of operating the programs. And what had not been consumed by inflation, looked as though it might be destroyed by the Carter budget pruners.

Now, however, many Congressmen and Senators admit they are uneasy about cutting too much support for research. Staff aides say the lawmakers have been impressed by arguments that research holds one of the few hopes for bolstering our competitive standing in world trade markets.

With negotiators still seeking to produce a compromise budget resolution that the House and Senate can live with, Congress last week still had a long way to go before the final spending levels would be settled for the next year. The appropriations panels that handle defense spending were still holding hearings last week. Although most other subcommittees in the House had heard all the testimony they were going to hear for this year, most had not scheduled mark up on their bills. and the Senate appropriations panels were basically on what one aide described as a "holding pattern," waiting for the budget resolution to be completed and the House to complete its versions of the spending proposals for fiscal 1981.

Although the appropriations figures are far from set, most of the authorizing committees have drawn up their legislative proposals, setting out what the federal programs are to accomplish in the year ahead.

Since the authorizing committees went to work it has been clear that the big science programs — those supported by the National Science Foundation and the National Institutes of Health — would fare somewhat better than other social and domestic programs in the budget process. For NIH, for example, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce has

(Continued on Page 3)

ACADEMY *(Continued from Page 1)*

that has gripped us for a decade. If the scientific community will not unfrock the charlatans, the public will not discern the difference and science and the nation will suffer."

Just which "charlatans" are to be unfrocked is not clear. But, with the Academy's reputation badly tattered by the food report and similar recent pratfalls, President Handler — now in the final year of a second six-year term — must be listening with interest to reports that at least one congressional committee may call him and his colleagues on the carpet to explain this squalid episode.—DSG

NAS Food Panel Quits in Protest

The latest fallout from the Academy's controversial nutrition report came June 11, when the Food and Nutrition Board's Consumer Liaison Panel announced it is severing relations with the Board.

Created by the Board in 1974 to provide a so-called consumer input to Board proceedings, the Panel, and a matching Industry Liaison group, play only an advisory role. But, according to the Panel's chairman, James Turner, the Board has rarely listened to its consumer advisors. In a letter to NAS President Handler, Turner said the Food and Nutrition Board holds "isolated, outdated" views.

Meanwhile, there are stirringgs inside the Academy for an examination of the Board's report and the steps that led up to it. One report has it that the issue is to be discussed by the NAS Assembly of Life Sciences, of which the Food and Nutrition Board is a part.

© Science & Government Report, Inc., 1980

ISSN 0048-9581

Editor and Publisher
Daniel S. Greenberg

Contributing Editor
Anne Roark

Associate Publisher
Wanda J. Reif

Circulation Manager
Susan Burke

European Correspondents
Michael Kenward (London); Francois Seguier (Paris)

Independently published by *Science & Government Report,* Inc., twice monthly, except once each in January, June & July. Annual Subscription: Institutions, $89.50 (two years, $168.50); individuals, $48.50 (two years, $82.50). Editorial offices at 3736 Kanawha St., N.W., Washington, DC 20015. Tel. (202) 244-4135. Second class postage paid at Washington, DC. Please address all subscription correspondence to Box 6226A, Northwest Station, Washington, DC 20015. Reproduction without permission is prohibited. SGR is available on Xerox University Microfilms. Claims for missing back issues will be filled without charge if made within six months of publication date.

. . . Committees Vote Boosts for NSF and EPA

(Continued from Page 2)

approved a bill, HR 7306, that would provide $3.8 billion for the institutes in fiscal 1981, $4.4 billion in 1982, and $4.9 billion in 1983 (SGR Vol. X, No. 10). President Carter had requested only $3.27 billion, compared to last year's figure of $3.44 billion.

For the National Science Foundation, the House Committee on Science and Technology approved a bill, HR 6728, that would provide $1.178 billion for research and education — $56 million above the President's revised request. The bill would provide an additional $23 million to encourage girls and young women to pursue careers in science and mathematics. The Senate bill, S 568, also included a special program for women, but otherwise went along with the Administration's request of $1.074 billion.

For health-manpower programs, the House Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce approved a total of $650 million, under HR 7203 and HR 7204. The bills represented a scaled-down version of legislation originally introduced by the chairman of the House Subcommittee on Health and Environment, Henry A. Waxman (D-Calif). Despite the reductions made by the committee, the bills have drawn stiff opposition from the Carter Administration, which earlier proposed a much more limited measure.

One example of the differences between the committee and the Administration had to do with support for nursing schools. The Carter Administration would like to do away with enrollment-based aid to nursing schools, whereas the committee's bill would maintain and actually increase support for those programs. Under the House bill, schools of nursing would receive $200 for each full-time student in fiscal 1981, $210 in fiscal 1982, and $220 in 1983.

Other enrollment-based aid, however, would be reduced gradually from fiscal 1981 through fiscal 1983, under the House measure. Dental, medical and osteopathic schools would receive maximum grants of $2000 for each student enrolled full-time in fiscal 1981 and $500 in fiscal 1983.

For the Environmental Protection Agency, the Senate has approved a $396.2-million re-authorization bill. The President's revised request was $369 million. Approximately $40 million of the Senate bill, S2726, would go to colleges and universities for research and development.

Awaiting floor action in the House last week was HR 7099, a bill that would provide EPA with $385.7 million for research and development.

For the National Aeronautics and Space Administration, the Senate recently voted to approve a $5.6 billion re-authorization bill — approximately $52.2 million above the President's revised request and $300 million above NASA's operating plan for fiscal year 1980.

In the presence of 10 to 11 per cent inflation in the aerospace industry, NASA's budget precludes any growth, yet it is generous and should be supported, said Sen. Howard W. Cannon (D-Nev).

One of the "dominant" features of the NASA bill, S 2240, according to Senator Adlai E. Stevenson (D-Ill), is $1.873 billion for the development of the space shuttle and for an orbiter fleet to support civil and military space operations.

The House is scheduled to vote on its version of the bill, HR 6412, later this summer.

Congress may not be as generous with energy research as it has been with other science programs. Although most appropriations committees have been waiting for the overall budget ceiling to be completed before going to work on particular spending measures, one appropriations panel has given its tentative approval to a measure that would provide $2.51 billion in support for energy supply, research, and development. The Administration had requested $2.66 billion for the programs. In earlier action, the authorizing committees had been fairly generous with energy research, thus suggesting to many observers that the Senate figures may be increased

(Continued on Page 4)

Proxmire Says He'll Repay US

Under a barrage of editorial ridicule for letting the federal government pay his legal fees in a libel suit arising from the celebrated Golden Fleece Award, Senator William Proxmire (D-Wisc.) says he's giving the government the royalties from his new book, "The Fleecing of America."

In an announcement from his publisher, Houghton Mifflin, Proxmire is quoted as saying, "It is ironic but true that the Federal government spent about $125,000 in defending me against a suit in connection with the Golden Fleece" — a reference to the case that he recently settled with Ronald Hutchinson, a Michigan psychologist who sued the Senator for unkind remarks about his research. "Some consider that expenditure in my defense as a fleece in itself," says the Senator in the press release. "They have suggested I fleece myself. They have a point."

Proxmire says that the $10,000 settlement that he made with Hutchinson came out of his own personal funds; also that he wrote the book himself, without the assistance of his government-paid staff — which, if true, surely ranks as an historic event in the literary life of the ghost-ridden US Congress.

R&D "Outlook" Report Finally Off the Press

The big forecasting chore that the Congress dumped on the White House science office in 1976 has borne heavy fruit — nearly 800 pages of lucid and turgid prose under the title of *The Five-Year Outlook: Problems, Opportunities and Constraints in Science and Technology.*

But, as is often the case when the White House doesn't care to be dictated to by the Congress, there was a bit of shuffling around, and the *Outlook* — which was supposed to be produced by the presidential Office of Science and Technology Policy — was shoved off to the National Science Foundation. The Foundation, which didn't care for taking on the perils of crystal-ball gazing five years ahead, then unloaded as much as it could on the National Academy of Sciences, government R&D agencies, and selected outside specialists.

Topics covered include the traditional scientific disciplines, problems of R&D in academic settings, and the usual collection of R&D-related social and political problems, among them energy, privacy, health care, and crime control.

Not to be missed in this great assemblage is NSF's convoluted disclaimer for the synopsis that it prepared of the main body of the work: "The National Science Foundation prepared this synopsis and is wholly responsible for any explicit or implicit departures from the original papers that may have resulted in the process. However, to the extent that the views expressed in the synopsis of the commissioned papers accurately reflect those expressed in the papers themselves, they are the views of the authors and not of the Director of the National Science Foundation or the United States Government."

Copies of the volumes are available from the Government Printing Office, Superintendent of Documents, Washington, DC 20402. Price for Vol. I is $4.25. Request stock number 038-000-00442-5. Price for Vol. II is $15.00. Request stock number 038-000-00441-7.

Hearst to Expand Its Science Magazine

Hearst Magazines has decided to go for a bigger share of the booming market for pop science magazines. Starting next March, its mini-size monthly *Science Digest* will be expanded to a fullscale magazine format. Still to be known as *Science Digest,* the bigger version will sell for $2 per copy; advertisers are being guaranteed sales of 400,000 copies.

Hearst thus joins a throng that includes *Omni,* published by Penthouse International and *Science80,* of the American Association for the Advancement of Science. Soon to join is Time Inc., with a monthly, *Discover.*

BUDGET *(Continued from Page 3)*

before the appropriations process is complete later this summer. The House Committee on Science and Technology, for example, approved an authorization measure, HR 6627, that would provide $12.8 million for the University Research Support program — $1.5 million more than President Carter had requested. The program encourages cooperation between universities and government laboratories.

The bill, which must be approved by the Committee on Foreign Affairs, would also provide $214.8 million for basic research in energy production, about a third of which would go to universities. The Administration had requested only about $68.2 million for universities. Earlier, the Senate Committee on Energy and Natural Resources approved an authorization bill, S 2332, that would provide a 10-per-cent across-the-board increase for the Department of Energy, including university research programs. Universities now receive approximately $350 million in grants from the department.

Last month, the Senate also passed a three-year reauthorization bill for the National Sea Grant program, which supports projects in marine science at 15 colleges and universities around the country. The measure would provide $67 million for fiscal 1981, $72 million for fiscal 1982, and $77 million for fiscal 1983. In March, the House passed its version of the bill, which would provide $55.5 million next year, $66 million in 1982, and $75 million in 1983.

Meanwhile, the Department of Agriculture has urged Congress for the second year in a row to eliminate a $11.5 million program in agriculture instruction. In hearings before the Senate subcommittee handling agriculture appropriations, Department officials said the program was relatively insignificant.

Overall, the Department is asking for a total research budget of $885.6 million — $28 million more than the current spending but nearly $22 million below the original January budget.

It is, of course, far too soon to tell what will actually happen by the time the entire budget process is complete. One thing is certain, however: If there is going to be a research budget at all in fiscal 1981, lawmakers will have to move fast. By now, both the House and Senate should be wrapping up appropriations measures instead of just beginning. Whatever cuts or additions are made under the pressure of the next few weeks, they are not likely to represent the best planning Congress is capable of doing. In fact, it may be the worst — even if it is generous. — Anne Roark

(The author is an Assistant Editor of the *Chronicle of Higher Education.)*

NSF Fills No. 2 Spot, Still Seeks Director

The White House has filled the number two post at the National Science Foundation with the nomination June 3 of Donald N. Langenberg, Professor of physics and electrical engineering at the University of Pennsylvania, to be Deputy Director. But as of this writing, it's still in pursuit of a successor for the top job, which will be vacated July 1 by Director Richard C. Atkinson.

Langenberg will succeed George C. Pimentel, who is returning to the University of California, Berkeley. In the event that the directorship is vacant after Langenberg takes office, he'll automatically step up to Acting Director.

As is customary, the search for an NSF director — generally regarded as one of academic science's most important and sensitive posts in Washington — is being carried out with a lot of behind-the-scenes politicking and secrecy.

The National Science Board, the so-called policy-making body for NSF, sent three names to the White House in accord with a legislative provision that says the Board "may make recommendations" for filling the post, and that the President won't fill it "until the Board has had an opportunity to make such recommendations."

The White House didn't like the Board's choices, and came back with the suggestion that it would be desirable to appoint a black. Specifically, the White House said it favored the appointment of John B. Slaughter, a black physicist and electrical engineer who served from September 1977 to June 1979 as NSF's Assistant Director for Astronomical, Atmospheric, Earth, and Ocean Sciences. Slaughter, the highest ranking black in NSF's 30-year history, came to the Foundation from the University of Washington and quit NSF to become Academic Vice President and Provost of Washington State University.

Slaughter got a lot of urgings to take the job — including a plea from one very senior Administration official — but having moved from Washington just a year ago, he said he didn't feel like moving back again. It was discreetly pointed out to him that there's a sound tradition of NSF directors going on to greater glories in academe — Atkinson is going to succeed another ex-NSF director, William McElroy, as chancellor at UC San Diego; but, even so, Slaughter declined. He could, of course, change his mind, but the word around science-policy circles is that the search has now turned elsewhere.

Highly respected for his service at NSF, Slaughter is regarded as rising star on the academic administrative scene, and seems destined — with or without the NSF directorship on his c.v. — to land eventually in a top-flight university presidency. Another element in the picture is the uncertainty that exists about the term of office of the NSF director when a new administration comes in.

The NSF Act states that "The Director shall serve for a term of six years unless sooner removed by the President." None has been removed upon a change of administration or at any other time. The issue, however, was not put to what might have been its nastiest possible test to date because the six-year term of Democratic appointee Leland Haworth coincidentally expired at the commencement of the first Nixon Administration.

Those science-policy mandarins who regard NSF as a holy institution contend that the Director, unlike other senior executive branch officials, is not obliged to and never has submitted a courtesy resignation to an incoming administration. In a crunch, the President would, of course, prevail, but it's worth noting that when Mr. Carter last year demanded resignations from all his major appointees — and then accepted them from secretaries Califano and Blumenthal — none was offered by his senior science officials, Director Atkinson and White House science adviser Frank Press. Both took the position that their jobs are non-political, while Carter's Georgia henchmen probably chose to regard them as smallfry that didn't matter for much in the big political shakeup that the President was carrying out.

In any case, the big uncertainty is Ronald Reagan. If he wins, would he retain one of Mr. Carter's top science appointees? Perhaps, but no one knows for sure, and that's contributing to the difficulty of filling the NSF directorship.—DSG

In Print

Journal of Social Reconstruction, aims to "cross the imaginary boundaries between science, social science, and aesthetics"; edited by Marcus Raskin, founding co-director of the Institute for Policy Studies, Washington, DC; quarterly; institutional rate, $39.50 per year; individuals, $19.50. Order subscriptions from: Earl M. Coleman, Publisher, Conklin Hill Road, Stanfordville, New York 12581.

Committee on Scientific Freedom and Responsibility, 1979 Annual Report, details activities of the group established in 1974 by the American Association for Advancement of Science in response to "whistle-blower" controversies and human-rights issues abroad; 78 pages, $2 per copy (pre-payment requested), available from: AAAS SFR-9, 1515 Massachusetts Ave. Nw., Washington, DC 20005.

R&D Universities Report Growth in Faculty

If faculty employment is a reasonable measure of academic health, the nation's big research-oriented universities, particularly the public ones, have come through recent economic and demographic troubles in quite good shape.

That's the conclusion that emerges from the report of a National Science Foundation survey of 320 institutions that grant doctorates in science and engineering.

Since 1974, NSF reports, these institutions have experienced a 4 per cent annual growth rate in employment of scientists and engineers — through January 1979, the cutoff date of the survey. The number of professionals increased in all major science and engineering disciplines, with mathematics and computer sciences leading the 1978-79 growth with a 6 per cent rise. Another finding was that from 1969-78 part-time science and engineering employment had been steady, at about 18 per cent of total employment, at doctorate institutions, while it grew, from 19 to 28 per cent, at below-doctorate institutions.

The generally optimistic report is tempered with forecasts of an employment decline resulting from the coming slump in the total number of new high school graduates. The likely impact, NSF says, "is a decline in future positions for new faculty. As the rate of faculty growth slows, universities may turn increasingly to part-time appointments to meet basic staffing needs."

The survey also found that "doctorate universities accounted for most of the full-time S/E (science and engineering) growth in academe during the seventies. At these institutions, the average annual growth of full-timers (3 per cent per year) between 1969 and 1979 exceeded the rate for part-timers (2 per cent per year). The leading 100 doctorate institutions in terms of R&D expenditures accounted for more than four-fifths of all academic R&D spending and graduate S/E spending and graduate S/E enrollment in 1978, and nearly three-fourths of total academic S/E professional employment in 1979."

Public universities experienced the greatest growth, 6 per cent, in science and engineering employment in 1978, NSF reports, "while the total number of S/E professionals at private doctorates declined by less than 1 per cent." Since 1973, the survey report continues, "the S/E employment in public institutions had expanded at four times the average rate (4 per cent per year) reported by private schools (1 per cent per year). As a result, public universities have accounted for 88 per cent of the overall S/E employment increases at doctorate institutions. The role of publicly controlled doctorate institutions in the performance of academic research has also expanded. These universities accounted for 65 per cent of R&D spending in 1978, compared to 61 per cent in 1973."

The more rapid expansion of the public institutions, NSF said, "occurred as the difference in the costs of education progressively widened between public and private institutions. Thus, in 1978 tuition and fees at private institutions averaged nearly 4½ times those at public institutions. The continuation of this trend, accompanied by the forecast downturn in the number of

(Continued on Page 7)

Scientists, Engineers, Enrollments, R&D Spending At Doctorate-Granting Universities

	Scientists and engineers		Graduate science enrollment		R&D expenditures	
	Jan. 1975	Jan. 1979	Fall 1974	Fall 1978	FY 1975	FY 1978
Total, all fields	**180,000**	**207,600**	**267,300**	**312,000**	**$3,334,000**	**$4,530,100**
			Percent distribution			
	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0	100.0
Engineering	10.9	10.9	21.4	21.2	11.3	13.1
Physical sciences	9.2	8.8	9.3	8.0	10.2	10.6
Environmental sciences	2.7	3.1	3.7	3.8	7.4	8.1
Mathematical and computer sciences	6.4	6.8	7.6	6.9	2.5	2.6
Life sciences	52.7	51.9	24.9	27.3	56.4	55.5
Psychology	5.1	4.8	9.3	8.9	2.2	1.9
Social sciences	13.0	13.6	23.9	23.7	7.2	5.8
Other sciences	——	——	——	——	2.8	2.4

SOURCE: National Science Foundation.

EMPLOYMENT *(Continued from Page 6)*

18- to 24-year olds during the eighties is expected to impact more heavily upon private institutions . . . since tuition and fees comprise 28 per cent of current fund revenues compared to 13 per cent in public institutions."

(Copies of the survey report, "Academic Employment of Scientists and Engineers Increased 4% in Doctorate Institutions in 1979," NSF Report 80-309, are available without charge from: National Science Foundation, Division of Science Resources Studies, 1800 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20550.)

DOE Appoints Info Chief

Andrew A. Aines, a retired Army colonel formerly with the National Science Foundation and the White House science office, has been appointed Director of Scientific and Technical Information in the Department of Energy.

Education Dept. Appoints Three to High Posts

New appointments at the recently established US Department of Education:

Gladys Chang Keith Hardy, named by President Carter to the post of Deputy Director of the National Institute of Education, a post she held on an acting basis since 1977.

Arturo Madrid II, former Associate Dean and Executive Officer, College of Liberal Arts, University of Minnesota, named by Education Secretary Shirley M. Hufstedler to direct the Fund for the Improvement of Secondary Ecucation.

Terry Tinson Saario, Senior Program Officer, Ford Foundation Division of Education and Research, named by Secretary Hufstedler to serve as Deputy Assistant Secretary for Planning and Program Integration.

A Vitally Important Reference Work At a Markedly Reduced Price

Science & Government Report International Almanac—1978-79

Nature **calls it: ". . .an essential source of reference for scientific administrators, politicians and students. . ."**

New Scientist **says: ". . .well-informed and . . . certainly well written."**

368 pages, hardbound, containing 22 original review articles on science-policy developments in all the major industrialized nations and the major developing nations. Plus, the official texts of important science-policy documents, including the historic speeches at the People's Republic of China National Science Conference, and President Carter's Message to Congress on Science Policy.

Published at $54 per copy—NOW AVAILABLE TO SGR readers for the reduced price of $29.50. (A full refund of purchase price will be made if for any reason the volume is returned in good condition.)

To place your order, please fill out the coupon and send to:

SGR International Almanac
PO Box 6226
Washington, DC 20015

Please send _____ copies of SGR International Almanac—1978-79 at the reduced price of $29.50 per copy.

☐ check enclosed

☐ please bill

Name _____

Address _____ Zip _____

News Notes: State, Local R&D, DNA Committee

While there's been a lot of conferencing over the past decade on the urgency of getting state and local governments to perform more research and development on their particular problems, the latest figures show that their R&D efforts amount to a mere speck in the total national R&D picture.

Compiled by the National Science Foundation, and current only to Fiscal Year 1977, the figures show that state and local R&D spending totaled $466 million in that year — a bit more than one per cent of national R&D spending.

NSF found that half of the R&D funds expended by state and local governments came from federal agencies; also that, overall, "no real growth has occurred in recent years."

At the state level, R&D expenditures totaled $358 million, with health research taking the largest share, $100 million.

NSF says that new programs are underway to stimulate state and local governments toward "an awareness of the need for research that may result in increased State R&D expenditures in future years."

The NSF Report, "State and Local Government R&D Expenditures, FY 1977," NSF Report 80-302, is available without charge from: National Science Foundation, Government Studies Group, 1800 G St. Nw., Washington, DC 20550.

•

Nearly one-third of the Department of Energy's 37,000-acre tract at Oak Ridge, Tenn., has been designated by DOE as a National Environmental Research Park, with research there to be coordinated by the Oak Ridge National Laboratory. Inquiries concerning research at the site should be addressed to: Director, Research Division, Oak Ridge Operations, US Department of Energy, Box E, Oak Ridge, Tenn. 37830.

NSF Education Funds Cut

A Senate appropriations subcommittee voted June 3 to cut $5 million from the National Science Foundation's budget for science education in fiscal 1980. The cut, which was requested by the Carter Administration, was part of an overall $8.5-million reduction in NSF's spending for the current fiscal year.

Included in the proposal is a $1.2-million reduction in science-education research programs and the elimination of $3.4 million in an instructional equipment program. About $400,000 also would be cut from NSF's "public awareness of science" program. The rescissions would bring the science-education budget to $73.2 million — nearly $7 million below the fiscal 1979 level.

The Senate bill also would cut about $1.5 million from NSF's ocean-margin drilling program and $2 million from the US-USSR scientific exchange effort.

In recommending the budget cuts, the HUD-Independent Agencies Appropriations Subcommittee turned down the Administration's request for an additional $950,000 for salary raises.

•

Former US Representative Ray Thornton (D-Ark.) has been appointed chairman of the Department of Health and Human Services' Recombinant DNA Advisory Committee. Thornton, who gave up his House seat in an unsuccessful run for the Democratic nomination for Senate in 1978, is President-designate of Arkansas State University. The 25-member DNA committee advises the Secretary of HHS and the Director of the National Institutes of Health on problems associated with DNA research.

Science & Government Report
Northwest Station
Box 6226A
Washington, D.C. 20015

Second class postage paid at Washington, D.C.

9999
Xerox-University Microfilms
300 N. Zeeb Rd
Ann Arbor MI 48106